

ANSWERING ISKCON

≡ MENU



Why only Krishna is not Supreme Part 5

September 26, 2017 by publisher, posted in arguments against iskcon, bhagavat gita related arguments

In the last post I took a popular verse of Bhagavat Gita and gave an alternative interpretation . Now I will take up the verse 18:55, where they take up this verse with pride and state that Krishna declares that only a Bhakta or a Devotee may understand him as he is. I will however not take up either Prabhupada's commentary or Shankara's commentary as there is always a possibility of referring to other verses. Then I will need to go through those verses and then provide an alternative explanation. So I will just take up the verse give it's plain meaning so the verse is as follows

भक्त्या मामभिजानाति यावान्यश्वस्मि तत्वतः ।
ततो मां तत्वतो ज्ञात्वा विशते तदनन्तरम् ॥ 55॥

bhaktyā mām abhijānāti yāvān yaś chāsmi tattvataḥ
tato mām tattvato jñātvā viśhate tad-anantaram

The plain translation is as follows

Only by loving devotion to me does one come to know who I am in truth. Then, having come to know me, my devotee enters into full consciousness of me.

Now one must understand that Samskritam is a language where you actually can bring multiple meanings to a word depending upon the context. Now the verse is “Bhaktya mam Abhijaanati”, “Bhaktya” means through Bhakti, I have already explained that Bhakti is derived from “Bhaj” which means undivided . So this means he who knows Krishna in an undivided way , now let me actually explain the verse again ,

bhaktyā - in an undivided way , mām- me , Abhijanati- knows , yāvān - To what extent , yaś chāsmi - who I am ,tattvataḥ- in reality. tato mām tattvato jñātvā - post that knowing me as I am, viśhate tad-anantaram- enters into the undivided whole.

So the translation of the verse would be as follows ,

Knowing me in an undivided way , the person see who I am what is my expanse and recognises me as I am. Post that he actually enters into the undivided whole.

I have actually interpreted “Antaram” to be divide, hence when some one actually sees Krishna in an undivided way meaning not merely as a Gopi Vallabha or the Son of Devaki and Vasudeva, but as the conscious principle. Such a person actually attains the Non dual undivided Brahman. This is the actual meaning of the verse. Not what Iskconites imagine it to be. So these are minor verses, with this we take up one more verse in this

case I will simply quote the Mahapashupataastra blog. The verse is 11:15 below is the quote

“During that narration Arjuna said:

“pasyami devam stava deva dehe |
sarvams tatha bhuta-visesa-sanghan |
brahmanam isam kamalasana-stham |
rsims ca sarvan uragams ca divyan |” (BG. 11:15)

This is Incorrectly (and purposely) translated by the Vaishnava websites as :

“Arjuna said: My dear Lord Krishna, I see assembled in Your body all the demigods and various other living entities. I see Brahma sitting on the lotus flower, as well as Lord Shiva and all the sages and divine serpents.“

However this translation is NOT authentic.

The phrase in 11.15 is “brahmanam isham kamalasana-stham”. Because the word “isham” appears between “brahmanam” and “kamala-asana-stham” it is a designation of Brahma who sits on the lotus, and hence the CORRECT translation should be - “Brahma who is the lord, is found seated on his lotus seat”. It very strongly proves that the sandwiched “Isham” is the quality of lordship and not a proper name. Therefore it refers to Brahma and states, “Lord Brahma is seated on a lotus“ “.

With this I conclude the refutation of the claim of Iskcon on Bhagavat Gita. Iskcon is only good for Bhakti , but they are not recommended when it comes to Bhagavat Gita, hence I would say please choose wisely on who actually tells the Bhagavat Gita. Shankara himself says that Bhagavat Gita is very difficult to understand and there were hundreds of commentaries on the Gita during his time. So I have simply referred Shankara Bhashyam and reinterpreted the verses in Shankara’s thought. I have also explained before the concept of Ishwara and so on. This should answer most of the claims which Iskcon makes on Bhagavat Gita.

PREVIOUS POST

[Why only Krishna is not Supreme Part 4](#)

NEXT POST

[Did Adi Shankara become a Vaishnava ?](#)

LEAVE A COMMENT

[Create a free website or blog at WordPress.com.](#)